



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/933,811	08/22/2001	Angelika Muscate-Magnussen	P67074US0	8139

7590 02/10/2005

JACOBSON HOLMAN
PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
400 SEVENTH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

LUDLOW, JAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1743

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

LD

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/933,811

Applicant(s)

MUSCATE-MAGNUSSEN,
ANGELIKA

Examiner

Jan M. Ludlow

Art Unit

1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 37-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 37-72 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1743

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

2. Claims 37-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/50886 (hereafter WO).

WO teaches a support material for use in electrochromatography having a reverse phase coating restricted to the interior of the pores.

WO fails to explicitly teach the method and apparatus for using the support in electrochromatography.

Art Unit: 1743

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the support as packing 60 in capillary 30 between containers 90 with voltage source 10 in order to use the support for its stated purpose. With respect to dependant claims, it would have been obvious to use know formats, such as microchannels, and know chromatographic detectors for their know function of miniaturization and analysis.

3. Applicant cannot rely upon the international application or foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15. Note that the instant application is a continuation-in-part of PCT/EP00/01393, which is not in English. In the absence of a certified translation of PCT/EP00/01393, the examiner has used the US filing date as the effective filing date of the claims.

4. Claims 32, 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pinkerton.

Pinkerton teaches the instant packings in a receiving unit with pressurization pumps P1, P2 and detectors D1, D2. Note that the intended use "for capillary electrochromatography" recited in the preamble has not been given weight because there are no corresponding structural limitations defining over a chromatography system.

5. Claims 33-40, 42, 44-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinkerton.

Pinkerton fails to teach the specific chromatographic set-ups claimed.

Art Unit: 1743

It would have been obvious to use known formats, such as microchannels, and known chromatographic detectors for their known function of miniaturization and analysis.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Colon, cited as an X reference in PCT/EP00/01393, teaches that chromatographic packings in accordance with his invention have functionalized groups on the surface and in the pores, and does not teach that they are different groups (col. 9, lines 60-65).

Kirkland teaches packings that may be used in electrochromatography (col. 3, line 28) and which may have functionalized exteriors and underivatized pores if the pores are too small to admit the derivatizing agent (col. 7, lines 20-30), but fails to teach or suggest that the small-pored embodiments are useful in electrochromatography.

7. Applicant's arguments filed November 29, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. Applicant argues that the WO reference is overcome by translation filed with the response filed November 29, 2004, but no such translation is of record.

9. Applicant requests an initialed copy of an IDS filed November 1, 2001, but no such IDS is of record.

10. Note that the response filed November 29, 2004 has an incorrect serial number on it. The instant application is 09/933811, not 09/931811 as stated on applicant's response.

Art Unit: 1743

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jan M. Ludlow whose telephone number is (571) 272-1260. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 11:30 am - 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on (571) 272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1743

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jan M. Ludlow
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1743

Jml
February 7, 2005